UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,660	12/28/2001	Kaushal Kurapati	US 010713	1819

24737 7590 10/23/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
RONES, CHARLES	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	5

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,660	KURAPATI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles L. Rones	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 December 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6-8, 12-17, and 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 ('Li').

Li discloses:

As to claim 1,

(a) determining a particular user of a browser; See 6:23-67;

(b) determining whether the browser has been previously bookmarked for a web page of a web site presently accessed by the particular user of the browser; See 5:15-67; 6:22-67;

(c) determining whether a record count exists for visits to the web page by the particular user if the browser has not been bookmarked; See 5:15-67; 6:22-67;

(d) if it is determined in step (c) that the record count exists, updating the record count to reflect the present access by the particular user, and creating an initial record count if it is determined in step (c) that no record count exists for the present webpage being accessed by the particular user; See 5:15-67; 6:22-67;

(e) determining whether the record count has reached a predetermined as threshold of visitation; See 5:15-67; 6:22-67;

(f) prompting the user as to whether it is desired to bookmark the webpage if it is determined in step (e) that the threshold has been reached; See 5:15-67; 6:22-67; and

(g) bookmarking the webpage if the user responds affirmatively to step (f); See 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 6,

(h) prompting the particular user to indicate as to whether it is desired to bookmark the address of the webpage; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 7,

wherein in response to an indication by the user desiring a bookmark, (i) proceeding to bookmark the address of the webpage; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 8,

wherein the predetermined threshold of the visitation count in step (f) consists of a tally of visits by the user to the webpage; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 12,

wherein the predetermined threshold in step (f) is set by the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 13,

wherein the bookmarking in step (g) is performed locally in a storage area communicating with a browser of the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 14,

wherein the bookmarking in step (g) is performed remotely in a storage area communicating with a browser of the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 15,

wherein the particular user selects whether the bookmarking is performed locally; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 16,

wherein the particular user selects whether the bookmarking is performed remotely; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 17,

wherein the recommendation made in step (g) is displayed to the user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 19,

wherein the bookmarking is performed by a Local Area Network (LAN) in communication with the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 20,

wherein the bookmarking is performed by an Internet Service Provider (ISP) of the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 21,

(h) confirming with the particular user after a certain predetermined period of time has passed without visitation of the webpage by the particular user whether the bookmark should be removed, and removing the bookmark if the particular user agrees to removal of the bookmark; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claim 22,

(h) purging the bookmark after a certain predetermined period of time has passed without visitation of the webpage by the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67.

As to claims 23-27, they are combinations and subcombinations of previously rejected claims and are rejected for their respective reasons as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 ('Li') in view of Shaw et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083148 ('Shaw').

As to claims 9-11,

wherein the predetermined threshold of the visitation count in step (f) comprises a combination of (i) the visitation count comprising more than one visit by the particular user; See Abstract; 5:15-67; 6:22-67;

Li discloses the claimed invention except for a total aggregate time spent viewing the webpage. Shaw teaches that it is known to provide a total aggregate time spent viewing the webpage. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a total aggregate time spent viewing the webpage as taught by Shaw, since Shaw states at paragraph 1 that such a modification would help value a website by not only showing the number of hits per day but also the average amount of time a user spends on the site to show a user an advertisement which translates into more revenue.

Claims 2-5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 ('Li').

As to claim 2,

Li discloses the claimed invention except for a determination of the particular user is made by speech recognition, by prompting for at least one of a password and user identification, by a capturing an image of the particular user by a camera, and comparing with images of authorized users in a storage area, and by iris detection. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a determination of the particular user is made by speech recognition, by prompting for at least one of a password and user identification, by a capturing an image of the particular user by a camera, and comparing with images of authorized users in a storage area, and by iris detection since it was known in the art that different methods of restricting access to data by verifying a user using a biometric or password would allow only those allowed to access data the ability to access the data by verifying the identity of that particular user. Also disclosed under Applicant's admitted prior art; See specification pages 10-11.

As to claim 18,

wherein the recommendation in step (g) is made by sound.

Li discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the recommendation in step (g) is made by sound. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wherein the recommendation in step (g) is made by sound since it was known in the art that a user can hear sound and that computer come with speakers, that providing a beep or voice to a user would enable the user to hear the response if he/she was visually impaired. Also disclosed in Applicant's admitted prior art; See specification pages 10-11.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles L. Rones whose telephone number is 703-306-3030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Charles L. Rones
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2175

October 19, 2003